

64

HAMMER

SP-SDF
64 E. Van Buren
Room 810--
Chicago, Ill.

AND

TONGS

DISCUSSION BULLETIN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY S.D.F.

CONTENTS:

On Conventions and Caususes

By Saul Mendelson.....Inside Front Cover

Foreign Policy

By International Affairs Committee.....Page 1

Election - 1964

By F. Albright.....Page 10

Shelter

By Saul Mendelson.....Page 12

Unemployment & Automation

By Carl Dahlgren & John McBride.....Page 14

Political Action

By Hannah and Francis Carner.....Page 15

An Item on Civil Rights

By Francis Carner.....Page 15

Educational and Vocational Security

By Francis Carner.....Page 15

ON CONVENTIONS AND CAUCUSES

At the last convention almost all the delegates participated in caucuses and the National committee was elected by an agreement between caucuses. I would be the last to argue against factions where the organization is divided into two or three groups whose programs and orientations are distinct and internally consistent. If the majority of the organization supports a distinct set of policies let that majority run the organization.

However what characterized the last convention was the fact that the "realignment" and "labor party" factions were extremely heterogeneous on all questions except political action. Their excuse for having a faction was the claim that the stand the party took on political action far overshadowed all else in importance. Essentially, the Meier-Mendelson faction consisted of people who rejected this claim.

Instead our emphasis was on the arenas of radical activity. Our resolution was adopted a year before Birmingham and the March on Washington. Reread the sections on the direct action movement and you will see that the resolution has stood up well.

On the other hand the fact that political action dominated the convention led to the election of an NC and NMC that I feel are unrepresentative of the membership on foreign policy. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the party was against the U.S. blockade resolution along these lines at the NMC, only because one leading supporter of the blockade was absent!

Given this situation, and given the fact (I hope!) that many supporters of realignment or the labor party, while continuing to prefer the advocacy of one position or the other, have dispelled their illusions that the party's advocacy of either position is a panacea for the party's ills or its main function, it is clear that the only way the party can get reasonable consideration of all parts of the platform at the convention and a national committee that is broadly representative of its views on domestic and foreign policy is by rejecting caucuses. Not forever! Just as long as there is no series of issues on which the party divides in some consistent fashion.

However the danger is that members and delegates will, if some people set up caucuses, panic and join them out of fear of isolation. I appeal therefore to the comrades to reject all pressure to get lined up in an organized caucus for the convention and for the election of national committee. On the scale of election of delegates this is a problem only in the larger locals. In a small local one or two lead the activity and want to go to the convention and that's that. I appeal, therefore, to the members of local New York especially to help to keep the convention from crystallizing into caucuses by rejecting such a crystallization in their voting for delegates from N.Y.

Our party has not had sufficient organized discussion and clarification. If there is a response to the appeal I make here, not the least of its results will be the opportunity to discuss at the convention rather than merely go through the motions while registering mandates.

by
Saul Mendelson

The National Convention in May will consider a platform for the Socialist Party. The following is a draft for the foreign policy section of that platform.

The draft was prepared by the International Affairs Committee for submission to the pre-convention Platform Committee. The International Affairs Committee had to the pre-convention Platform Committee. The International Affairs Committee had differences on many items in the draft, and it is submitted primarily to initiate discussion on foreign policy.

It is to be hoped that the statement adopted by the Convention will be much shorter, since the Platform must be a balanced document giving adequate concern to all aspects of our political program without being over-long.

FOREIGN POLICY

After the end of World War II, and with the beginning of the cold war, the United States government set a general foreign policy which it has followed fairly consistently. It was a policy of the containment of Communism, if necessary by war or the threat of war. Everything else was subordinate to that. We supported a UN which in the earlier years we and our allies substantially upheld. We built up the NATO alliance and others less strong. Very often, but not always consistently, our government sought to make other and smaller nations openly side with us against Communism. We were fairly generous with relief but since the end of our post-war relief, not on any very well thought-out program, there has been far too little aid given and far too much distribution of military hardware to small nations.

Today, that kind of general foreign policy is dangerously inadequate or worse. The cold war goes on, even though there is an uneasy detente between Washington and Moscow. Our alliances, including NATO and the Organization of American States, are in great disarray. We face a Communism which is no longer monolithic but polycentric. The breach between Moscow and Peking is sharp. Khrushchev is now on terms of more or less friendship with Tito but Yugoslavia does not accept Russian domination of her policies.

Revolution of Rising Expectations

The situation provides no realistic basis for our present policy. The Socialists repeat our insistence in our former platform that if there were no Communist imperialism, to compete with what we miscall "free enterprise," that is, a far-flung capitalism, there would still be great strains on peace because of the tremendous "revolution of rising expectations" which expresses itself most forcibly in revolt against colonialism but also against an intolerable burden of poverty and economic exploitation. It is one of the happier facts of the years since 1945 that so much imperialism has been liquidated with so little violence. For this mankind owes more than it realizes to the British government under the Labor Party.

The Struggle for Freedom of Still-Colonial People in Africa

There remain, however, important areas to be freed from the colonial yoke; and to those who struggle in them for freedom the Socialist Party pledges its sympathy and all forms of practicable support.

We favor an embargo on arms to the governments of Portugal and the Union of South Africa. We oppose the transfer by Britain to Southern Rhodesia of any armed forces

after the dissolution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. We oppose independence to the present white settler-dominated self-governing colony of Southern Rhodesia.

The Socialist-led Scandinavian countries last year initiated negotiations with the independent African nations for a joint program to be submitted to the UN with the objective of achieving full freedom and majority rule for the people of South Africa, accompanied by guarantees or rights for all minorities. The US should support these efforts. We join the Socialist International in condemning the principles and the practice of Apartheid, and in deploring the increasingly repressive legislation imposed by the South African Government and, in furtherance of the resolution of the United Nations Security Council on August 7th, 1963, urge all Socialist parties to exert the maximum influence on their respective Governments to bring about the immediate ending of all arms supplies to South Africa.

We call upon them to explore other methods of effective pressure upon the South African Government with a view to the promotion of equality between all racial groups in South Africa.

Terror and Communist Agitation

The immediate threat of a large-scale war of annihilation rises from nuclear rearmament and the intransigency of the great powers, the USSR, China, and, unfortunately, also the USA. That intransigency is backed by enormous military power in Russia and China--two Communist nations which, however, because of differences between them, are far from constituting completely unified power. Yet the great gains of Communism since World War II have not resulted from Russian armed aggression (although Russian force was outrageously used against rebellion in Hungary), but by the presence of Communist soldiers in these countries and by victories within nations in which strong parties have first been won to Communist ideology. This type of aggression cannot successfully be fought by nuclear bombs.

Our great battle with Communism is ideological and it cannot be won by identifying democracy and respect for human rights with capitalism--not even with the somewhat modified capitalism which prevails in America after the New Deal, and its establishment of a welfare state by the appropriation of ideas formerly regarded as American propaganda for democracy against the ruthless Communist totalitarianism suffers enormously from the facts that 1) so many Americans debate democracy and freedom to the level of mere anti-Communism, and include such nations as Saudi Arabia and Franco's Spain among the free people; 2) they persist in volubly (and falsely) equating democratic Socialism and totalitarian Communism; 3) many of Communism's haters in this country act so obviously from love of power and private profit rather than from any true love of mankind.

Our American Neighbors

Our opposition to all totalitarian regimes certainly includes Cuba in that category. We are sympathetic to those Cuban exiles who favor the restoration of democracy but we oppose the return to foreign corporations of their property expropriated from whatever investments. We are opposed to the efforts of the Castro Government to support and build totalitarian movements elsewhere in Latin America.

Our opposition to the Castro regime, however, does not blind us to the necessity of opposing efforts by Cuba's former imperialist master, the United States, to impose its will on her. We favor normal diplomatic and trade relations between the US and Cuba.

We favor the restoration of the US quota for purchase of Cuban sugar. Since the lease of Guantanamo in perpetuity was obtained under duress as a condition for US evacuation of Cuba in 1901, we should renegotiate the possession of this base.

The Alliance for Progress was initiated as a program of expanded US aid to Latin America. Aid programs would include all aspects of development, but, in addition, would for the first time include major grants and loans for social purposes--low-cost housing, education, community development, health, sanitation. The Alliance programs were to be conditioned upon the recipient countries' willingness to help themselves through substantial reforms of their tax structure and land distribution and through the adoption of comprehensive plans for the use of Alliance aid. The idea of self-help is, of course, directly associated with the notion that the people of Latin American countries will control their own destinies through democratic governments.

The achievement of the Alliance's stated aims, in terms of growth of per capita income, lengthening of life expectancy, rise in literacy, was presumed to require, besides \$10 billion in US grants and loans in a ten-year period, an equal amount of foreign private capital, as well as the ability of the Latin American economies to generate considerable capital investment from domestic sources.

We may now weigh the plans for the Alliance against the years of its execution:

The US government has authorized funds on the scale that had been projected--approximately \$1 billion a year. Most of the funds authorized have not been committed to a specific project because of the failure of most of the Latin American countries to submit adequate plans. None of the Latin American countries has made substantial changes in its tax structure. Only a few have even made a feeble beginning. No new land reform program has been adopted that is substantial in scope. (The programs of Mexico, Bolivia and Venezuela antedate the Alliance.) Not only has the trend of declining US private investment in Latin America continued, but in 1962 there was a small actual net disinvestment! At the same time the Latin American countries suffered intensification of their balance of payments problem, because out of the Latin American countries in one year flowed a billion dollars in profits on the existing US private investments. Meanwhile Latin American private domestic investment remained grossly inadequate, and considerable Latin American private capital flowed into investments in Western Europe and the United States.

As democratic Socialists we oppose in Latin America both military rule and rule by civilian oligarchies based on the privileged groups in society. We condemn the policy of aid to military dictatorships. We oppose military aid to all Latin American nations. We favor a great expansion of the level of economic aid to democratic governments already engaged in significant social reform--Costa Rica, Venezuela, Bolivia, Uruguay, Mexico. We demand that in the case of other formally democratic governments the requirements for aid under the Alliance for Progress be enforced. We call upon the US Government to cease discrimination against nationalized industries in its development loans. We support the efforts of democratic revolutionary and democratic Socialist parties and of free trade unions in the Latin American countries, and urge the AFL-CIO to aid these organizations without political conditions.

In the case of Panama, where we hold effective sovereignty over a strip of land that cuts the country in two, our rights are likewise based on military might. We abetted the revolt by which Panama succeeded from Colombia, prevented Colombia from suppressing the revolt and extorted a perpetual lease from the new Panamanian Government on the terms previously rejected by Colombia. We should immediately wipe out all

discrimination and inequity suffered by Palestinians working in the Canal Zone and raise substantially our annual payments to Panama for the Zone. We should move toward the internationalization of the Canal Zone and of the operation of the Canal itself, as we also should request internationalization of the Suez Canal and other narrow waterways of importance to more than one country.

Middle East

In striving to bring about that linking of military disengagement and universal disarmament for which the Socialist Party has steadfastly fought, we repeat the proposal set forth in our previous platform that our country seek to get Soviet agreement to support United Nations action toward disarmament in the Middle East, accompanied to guarantee of any and all Middle Eastern nations against military aggression or any attempt to change boundaries by force. Such an international agreement should supersede the tripartite pact of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States. We again call upon the United States to seek to provide at least part of the cost for a solution to the Arab and Jewish refugee problems with the cooperation of the United Nations, Israel, the Arab nations and our own country.

We stress again the need for economic assistance and the furtherance of development projects with a view to facilitating constructive cooperation for the benefit of all states in the region, like Eric Johnson's plan for joint Arab-Israeli utilization of the Jordan's waters for irrigation purposes. We call upon the Arab states and Israel to enter into direct negotiations without prior conditions prejudicial to either side, with the aim of reaching a peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues and creating conditions of peaceful and fruitful co-existence.

We join with the Socialist International in deploring the continued tension in the middle East which causes and exacerbates instability and also hampers its social-economic development. While we look with favor on the movement for Arab unity both as alternative to constant internecine warfare and to repeated invitations to revolt and murder their fellow-rulers, we express the fervent hope that such unity will be for constructive social purposes and not for united military action against other lands. We view with anxiety the arms race in the area, the large-scale supplies of Soviet arms to the United Arab Republic, and the work of former Nazi experts in Egypt on the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. We urge the International to follow through on its intention of attempting to establish friendly relations with all progressive forces in the Arab world and the wider area of the Middle East that are dedicated to the cause of peace.

Peace and Progress, Democracy and Human Welfare

The Socialist Party renews its insistence that in democratic Socialism lies the strongest defense against Communist totalitarianism, cruelty, and disregard of human rights. To the degree that the US by its policy shores up dictators, corrupt governments, and great landlords in underdeveloped sections of the world, it invites a defeat which no attainable military strength can indefinitely forestall. What the US needs and what capitalism, decked out as "free enterprise," cannot supply is a philosophy of human development in underdeveloped lands.

The lifeline to peace must be braided of four strong strands: 1) universal disarmament down to a police level for preserving peace in nations and between nations; 2) a steady strengthening of an international organization, the United Nations, so that it can substitute law for war in our present anarchic world of absolute nation-states;

3) orderly disengagement from American military commitments around the world which are more likely to lead to war than peace; 4) increased engagement in the holy war against poverty, illiteracy and disease around the world.

Following the death of Stalin, pressure from the people forced a slow and gradual, sometimes reversing, softening of dictatorship in the Communist countries. This has enabled the progressive elements, at present mainly students and intellectuals, to put forward partial demands for further democratization and improvement of the living standard of the masses; in one form or another they struggle for such demands. This struggle finds support in the revisionist developments within the international Communist movement. We, American Socialists, sympathize with and support the people in the Communist countries in their struggle against the regime for such partial demands. We believe that a lessening of war tensions strengthens the progressive elements, and we know that the liberation of the Communist-occupied countries is a problem which cannot and must not be solved by war. We further believe that an expansion of trade and cultural relations with the Communist countries will help to prepare an atmosphere favorable to a more fundamental change. We maintain our belief that ultimately the Communist dictatorship will be replaced by a democratic Socialist society.

We oppose interference in the development of other, especially newly created countries, but we do not want to hide that we are against dictatorship everywhere, whether of colonial rulers or of native despots, and that we, Democratic Socialists, are with our comrades in the democratic Socialist camp of those countries. While we understand the need for protection of democracy all over the earth, we do not share but deplore the resorting to a one-party, so-called "socialist" regime which never can be socialist if it is not democratic, but totalitarian.

The fate of those who have been imprisoned or detained for political, racial and religious reasons in the Republic of South Africa, in Korea and Vietnam, the arrest of leaders of the Asian Socialist Conference in Burma, among them U Ba Swe and U Kyaw Myeth, the continued imprisonment of Congress leaders in Nepal and Indonesia as well as the suppression of Democrats and Socialists in Spain and Portugal and her colonies, and the continuing suppression of Social Democrats and other Democrats in the Soviet countries compel us to express our solidarity with these and other victims of political, racial, and religious persecution.

The United Nations is bound by the declaration of human rights and we condemn therefore the actions taken by governments which deprive men of their liberty only because of their political conviction, race and religious belief. We urge the United Nations to ensure the respect of human rights in all regions under their control.

We demand the release of all prisoners whose detention is incompatible with the declaration of human rights.

Disarmament

In the popular mind all over the world disarmament is most intimately tied to peace. Support for it is growing, and with reason. The world is no safer, while nations play with nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons, than a kindergarten where children play with loaded revolvers. Armament races may be originally the expression rather than the causes of national fears and suspicions, but often they in themselves have tended to be causes of war--so the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Grey, declared the Anglo-German naval race to be before World War I--and unquestionably total disarmament along the US-Canadian border contributed mightily to settlement of

bitter boundary disputes. Almost all the world has given lip service to disarmament. It has been subject to repeated unsuccessful negotiation since World War II. However, the Soviet Union and the US have agreed to principles of disarmament, and the Antarctic continent has been made subject to an effective treaty barring military experimentation on it. The Soviet Union and the US have at last placed their respective programs, worked out in considerable detail, before the Geneva Conference.

Yet agreement at that conference is unlikely. The nations are too far apart on procedures and timing. And though there is great public acceptance of the desirability of disarmament and what Eisenhower, Khrushchev, and Kennedy have all called the "unthinkability" of war, as yet there is neither an emotional nor practical basis for effective general disarmament in the attitudes of governments or peoples; nor will they yet accept any substitute for the grim arbitration of war in their conflicts.

On the contrary, there is in the US another obstacle to disarmament and that is the ironic fact that on the arms race, which does so much to keep the world poor, so many Americans believe their jobs and their prosperity depend--this in a world in which, properly used, a relatively small proportion of the 117 billion dollars spent annually by nations rich and poor on their arms races might rapidly wipe out poverty.

It is essential to disarmament that there be in this country an economic program for the transition from the arms race to a peace race. The Disarmament Agency should be instructed to keep such a program up-to-date.

If we must expect the final treaty on disarmament to drag, there is the more reason to keep up pressure for continuing or renewing negotiations. Meanwhile the US can do a great deal to change the climate of negotiation by what have been called unilateral initiatives, that is, acts toward peace not in themselves destroying our military might but clearly showing our desire to end the cold war on its military level. The greatest of these acts has been the test ban treaty, but the struggle for disarmament must go on and it should be supplemented by other acts of the United States to show how sincerely we seek to lessen general tensions and make possible a general disarmament backed by the citizenry of the world. The Socialist Party pledges itself to a policy of thorough discussion of such initiatives and active support of realistic proposals.

The United Nations

We do not think it possible or desirable at this juncture in history to set up a world government as centralized in power as the US now is. We do think it possible, and essential, to strengthen the UN in the confidence of the peoples and in its power to substitute law for war. This is in part a matter of education of the people in our own and other countries. The UN was founded on the gamble that the Big Three, the USA, the USSR, and the United Kingdom, who held together to win the war, would hold together to maintain the peace. This hope was frustrated by the rapidly developing cleavage responsible for the cold war, sharply accentuated by the rapidly developing cleavage Security Council for the cold war, sharply accentuated by the rapidly developing cleavage that the UN and its agencies have done as well as they have in serving peace and promoting international cooperation.

The US can immediately strengthen the UN by its purchase of bonds as originally proposed by President Kennedy, and by its repeal of the Connally reservations under which our government makes itself judge of what case in which it is involved it will allow to go to the World Court. Beyond this lie problems which would seem to involve charter revision for a fairer system of representation of nations, the strengthening of

power to arbitrate disputes, and the creation of a police force directly under its control.

There is also room for properly organized regional federations under the UN, e.g., a United States of Europe and a developed Organization of American States, and for multi-national agreements on trade, etc., but care should be taken that they do not conflict with a growth in the strength of the UN to deal with problems of universal importance. An interdependent world requires an inclusive world organization to supplant an anarchy of absolute nation-states or blocs formed by them. It is, to take an outstanding illustration, an idle dream to think that we can get properly controlled disarmament under a UN which does not include the effective government of China.

Since World War II the USA under a mixture of motives has assumed military obligations all over the world to contain Communist expansion. Many of these commitments run beyond our wisdom or our strength to maintain by military force at any price we can afford to pay. In Laos the US invested 300 million dollars in the support of an unpopular and corrupt regime. We purchased big cars for our friends, we supported a coup d'etat, we drove Laotians who had been sympathetic to democracy toward the Pathet Lao. The immediate situation in Laos requires the creation of an authentic neutralist regime whose integrity will be guaranteed by both power blocs. In South Vietnam the US must back democratic social reform and political freedom. We do not believe that America should "turn its back" on the people of Southeast Asia or of anywhere else. Rather we believe that a combined program of disarmament and social change, supported by the US, is the only meaningful alternative for the new states of the colonial revolution. We shall not serve democracy or peace by our engagement in protracted jungle war in Southeast Asia.

It is obvious on the one hand that many of these world crises would virtually disappear in a disarmed and federated world, and, on the other, that while they are acute they block emotionally and practically any substantial progress in disarmament negotiation. So closely tied are disarmament, military disengagement, and the strengthening of the UN.

The German Problem

The question of Berlin is only a symptom of the whole German problem. If we want peace, we must refuse to give Germany nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly. This means specifically not going ahead with the plan for a multi-national nuclear naval force. Berlin must not become the bridgehead of West Germany against the East, but free access to and from the city, and its complete freedom must be guaranteed by the Soviet Union under the supervision of the UN. The Wall of Shame separating East and West Berlin must be destroyed because it not only handicaps or prevents free communication, but it is and will always be seen as a hated and hostility-provoking expression of an iron curtain and dictatorial interference in free human relations.

China

Our nation's most inexcusably dangerous commitment is to the absurdity that Chiang should still be recognized as president of China and entitled to represent her in the UN. It is doubtful how justly he represents even Taiwan, where he has never risked a popular vote. He represents only the American Seventh Fleet.

In the light of such facts as these the Socialist Party demands of our Government:

The prompt beginning of negotiations looking to the seating on proper terms of the effective government of China in the UN, and in the name of humanity an offer of food for the relief of famine. Proper terms would include some provision for Taiwan to determine its own status after peace prevails in the Far East. Meanwhile it could be represented in the UN as Taiwan.

Re-examination of military commitments under all existing alliances or bilateral treaties, reports to the people on them and on the reasons for them, and plans for progressive military disengagement from them.

International War on Poverty

Socialists everywhere demand increased engagement in the holy war against poverty, illiteracy, and illness, most of which is not at all necessary any longer in our fast developing industrialized society.

This is a matter of more money but not wholly of money. In terms of human service, the Socialist Party hails the work of the Peace Corps and of hundreds of Americans rendering similar services under non-governmental agencies. We need men to use money well. Few responsible men in this field believe that more than--if as much as--\$10 billion of American money annually can now be wisely used under proper conditions.

In respect to financial aid, the Socialist Party urges that:

1. Aid should be strictly economic, not directed to military builds. It should be sufficient for its purposes. Too little aid may actually make conditions worse in a world where, despite considerable aid, the gap between the have and have-not nations has widened since World War II.

2. As far as possible the excellent mechanisms of the United Nations should be used. Every effort should be made to realize SUMED, to which every nation should contribute 1% of its national income.

3. Aid except in cases of relief or desperate hunger or disaster should be directed to specific economic developments to raise the standard of living of the masses.

4. All aid and loans must be directed toward the rebuilding of the country and not to the strengthening of the governing elite of the military and landlords. Recipient nations should be required to set up special agencies capable of honest and efficient administration.

5. Where the economy of nations obviously suffers from terribly regressive taxation and a feudal land system, effective reforms must be instituted as a condition of any worthwhile aid.

6. Where the problem of the population explosion in already overpopulated nations is serious, the recipient nations should be urged to make available proper means and facilities for birth control.

To sum up this section on foreign policy: A distinction between foreign and domestic policy at this juncture in history is a matter of convenience of description rather than of essential differences in policy or principle. Politics--in the most inclusive sense of the word--does not and cannot stop at the waterfront. Not in a world which, if it would live in peace and decency, must give meaning to the truth that above all nations is humanity. Man by his own scientific skills has made it impossible to use great wars for other than physical and spiritual destruction of humanity. This is the stark truth which now compels all men to work for a world with increasing cooperation and without war.

The Socialist Party requests that the United States government continue its efforts to end the arms race and to replace national defense or alliance systems by a system of international law backed by appropriate forces under the UN.

Measures of disarmament must be such that the balance of power is maintained and must increase, not decrease, the security of the peoples concerned.

Adequate safeguards must be devised to protect the nations who observe the treaties from aggression by a state which evades or violates such disarmament agreements.

We call upon our government and all nations to oppose the proliferation of nuclear weapons and their further distribution to other nations. Such developments add to the risk of nuclear war and make more difficult the task of limiting and controlling nuclear weapons by international agreement. The test ban agreement can be one step on a long road toward real peace in the world, but only if it is followed by other steps to further measures of disarmament and by political efforts to solve those problems which are the underlying reasons for the present international tensions.

(10) Feb. 5, 1964

ELECTION - 1964

We, members of the Socialist Party, U.S.A., all covet for our Party a large and vigorous organization, recognized officially as a political party, with a full slate of the names of our nominees printed on the ballots of all fifty states, as a matter of course.

In the 1964 presidential election there may not be a single state in which it will be possible for our Party to get on the ballot without the expenditure of time and money which we do not have and cannot afford. In many states (perhaps most) this is physically impossible, given our present resources.

Nevertheless I propose that we nominate candidates for President and for Vice-President; that we run a write-in campaign even in states (if there by any such) where write-ins are not officially recognized and counted.

Our candidates would not necessarily need to campaign actively although that would be desirable. (Here I am not suggesting the drafting of Comrade Thomas - rather I have in mind other comrades who cannot devote time from their work for much campaigning.) During the campaign the job of all of us would be to publicize our program. This is no different from what we should be doing anyway. However there is this great difference; during presidential elections people are far more receptive to a political message than at any other time.

This unique opportunity to propagate Socialism would, without candidates, be drastically curtailed - almost to the vanishing point. If there had been candidates for whom to campaign in 1960 our platform would have received far more publicity and hence had a much greater circulation.

I asked a number of people, some of them former members but all of them fairly well informed about our Party, to give reasons why answers: "Puttillity" "Cost" "Too much work for the few willing to work" and the reply of the majority, "Every one should work and vote for the better candidate of the two major parties."

Personally I admit of only two valid reasons for not having candidates - valid, that is, for socialists. They are: a) cost, and b) numerically small vote. With a write-in campaign the cost would not be much. We always do campaign on issues and distribute literature. I assume we are planning to do the same this election whether we have candidates or not. But with no candidates we have absolutely no way in which to register our wishes at the polls. We produced a good platform in 1960 and again in 1962, and then never gave ourselves an opportunity to vote for them!

Just now there is no prospect for any thing but a very small vote. With a lively, well-publicized campaign for write-ins this need not be the case. In recent years in both Republican and Democratic state primaries write-in candidates won nominations over those whose names were on the ballot. It can be done. (Just as I am writing this I hear that a write-in campaign is to be conducted for Nixon in New Hampshire.)

(11)

There are many cogent reasons for having candidates. Democratic Socialism is a world-wide movement. What would we think of political parties that were strong in most of the countries of a state that refused to campaign in counties where they were weak? By not campaigning to the best of our ability are we not failing in our duty to the international socialist movement? After all most of us joined the Socialist Party because we wanted to be active politically for Socialism.

Why abandon the political field to the pseudo socialists? To the undemocratic and to the sectarian?

When we have no candidates many people infer that we have ceased to exist as a party. I remember well how embarrassing it was for members to admit to friends and acquaintances that our Party had no candidates. I was twitted over and over about having no party either.

The size of the vote is not of primary importance, but the opportunity to campaign for Socialism is. With candidates we will probably have a small vote; with no candidates we will have no votes. Which is preferable?

At election times, organizations, as, for example, the League of Women Voters, often invite speakers for the candidates, to address them. With announced candidates we are much more likely to be invited. This applies as well to forums, panels, and discussion groups.

We have a tradition - a good one - of running candidates. It gives us a chance to vote for what we believe. Without them we are disfranchised. We could, of course vote for what we do not want. We will in all probability get it anyway.

I have shown, I hope to your satisfaction, the way to avoid the only arguments against putting up candidates that have any validity, or at least have shown the way around them. They are: The Cost, which would not be great with a write-in campaign; The Small Vote, which is not so terribly important after all - especially when compared with no vote.

To those comrades who deem it essential to vote for the lesser evil I have naughting to say except that I am convinced that they are woefully mistaken. (This is no way precludes voting against a fascist - for a progressive.)

Remember President Johnson has pledged to continue the cruel and futile war in Vietnam. Also he is supporting the waste of resources entailed in attempting to get a man onto the moon - resources which are so desperately needed on earth to bring the "abundant life" to deprived millions of our fellows.

Let us, therefore, nominate candidates this year. Let us waste no time or money in filing fees or in circulating petitions to get on the ballot. Let us utilize all our resources in spreading the gospel of Democratic Socialism. This is the way to approve our new 1964 Party platform. Thank you!

Fraternally,
Paul F. Albright, Local Los Angeles

The following statement on shelters was adopted overwhelmingly by National Committee mail vote in 1962. I am submitting it here to be included in the foreign policy platform.

by Saul Mendelson

We oppose the current Administration shelter program. The effectiveness of any shelter program depends not only on its own size but on the size and strength of the weapons developed by Russia. Hence a massive shelter program is merely another step in the escalation of the arms race. There is no fundamental difference in net effect between increasing the strength, number and deliverability of nuclear weapons, increasing civil defense or increasing the strength and effectiveness of anti-missile weapons. All together make up the present balance of terror. An expanded shelter program is therefore incompatible with a policy of unilateral initiatives toward disarmament.

In addition, an expanded shelter program, if put forward seriously on a magnitude that would make it a substantial contribution to civilian safety at least at the current level of nuclear strength of Russia, would also raise an important problem of social priorities. Given the fact that any shelter program that was conceivably not a mere delusion would be many times the size of the current Administration bill, we must point out that by rejecting civil defense as in conflict with initiatives toward disarmament, we are thereby at the same time making more viable any pressure for greatly increased Federal programs in furtherance of education, health and welfare.

By rejecting the shelter program we are at the same time committing ourselves to oppose the use of an illusory civil defense program for creating a false sense of security among the American people and for perpetuating a fear psychology. We do not wish to foster a belief that there is any possible substitute for disarmament as a basis for security in today's world.

UNEMPLOYMENT & AUTOMATION

Unemployment and poverty level existence as we know it today is serious, but only a harbinger of much more to come as automation reaches maturity and additional "defense" spending loses its "utility".

We support the token gestures toward the solution of the current problem. Among these are extended and increased unemployment compensation; extensive retraining program for the technologically displaced persons; public works program in needed projects and services; undated vocational training which bears a relationship to the present needs of industry; a "G.I. Bill" for all college age students, male and female; who qualify for post high school training; and a domestic "peace corps" with skilled-concerned workers.

In addition to the above measures, we support a minimum wage of \$2.00 per hour; a work week of 25 hours; a law outlawing "moonlighting"; compulsory retirement at age 55; and compulsory registration of all jobs with state employment agencies.

All the above measures are token steps called for within the framework of our profit motivated, private property oriented economy. None of these measures will reach the person who has never become a member or an associate of our affluent society. The cry is made for jobs because we accept the old standard that the poor must work in order to eat. With all our intricate legal devices to protect the innocent, there is only one crime for which punishment is meted out with consistency, that is the crime of being poor.

If we are to solve the problem of poverty, we must address it directly. A subsidy to the large farm, the mill operator, an airline or a suburban railway, a tax cut, a defense contract, reduction of the rate of interest in the Federal Reserve System, all of these may filter down to some of the poor, but this kind of economics, if the elimination of poverty is our goal, is like flying to Hong Kong to save money on a new suit.

We must underwrite the family as our most valuable natural resource. If we can subsidize every other facet of our economy and many foreign countries dedicated to the destruction of democracy, the time has come when we must subsidize our citizens who are always good enough to die for their country, why not good enough to live for it?

Therefore be it resolved that: The head of every family of four should receive a subsidy sufficient to bring his or her income up to \$5,000 per year and \$1,000 for each additional child until such child becomes self supporting.

Resolved that: All single workers, male or female, should receive a subsidy sufficient to bring their income up to \$3,000 per year.

Resolved that: Unwed mothers with one child should receive \$3,000 per year with \$1,000 for each additional child until he or she becomes self supporting.

Resolved that: Anyone whose condition of unemployment or underemployment could benefit by increased training or relocation should

Unemployment & Automation - continued

(14)

be given the opportunity for either or both at government expense.

Resolved that: Retired workers should receive a minimum of \$2,500 per year per person, with all medical, hospital, surgical and nursing home care defrayed by the government.

Resolved that: All orphans, handicapped, or disabled persons shall become wards of the state who will see to their care, welfare, education and if possible, rehabilitation through foster homes or whatever method best meets the need.

Resolved that: None of the aforementioned benefits shall be contingent upon the liquidation or surrender of any personal assets such as the deed to ones personal residence, a motor vehicle, the tools of ones trade, books or any other personal possession with the exception of investment capital.

Resolved that: Anyone falling within the framework of the aforementioned minimums for decent existence shall pay no income tax on the minimum income or on any additional benefits such as education or medical care.

Resolved that: Through the income tax procedure, an absolute maximum on personal income should be established at \$50,000 per year with provisions for spreading this ~~income~~ over a number of years in those professions where peak earning power is limited to a few years or subject to great fluctuation.

Finally, be it resolved that: None of the aforementioned benefits shall be limited or denied on the basis of color, creed, national origin or moral standards.

Submitted by Carl Dahlgren & John McBride
Center City Branch - Local Philadelphia

Educational and Vocational Security - continued

rural communities. That is why we are proposing this plan for paying people to attend school - a Federal Educational and Vocational Security program for all beyond the age of 16.

Such a program would:

1. Make it economically possible for the illiterate and unemployable to bring himself into the mainstream of American labor. An important job-going to school-would be found for almost all of the unemployed.
2. Need more school buildings - a massive public works project.
3. Re-emphasize the important role of universal free public education.
4. Aid to prevent high school dropouts. It will stop the hypocrisy of telling the empty pocketed 16 year old that the greatest contribution he can make to his country is to finish his education and then leaving him empty pocketed.
5. It will relieve the burden on the parents of the college youth.
6. It will give a substantial income to the displaced skilled worker worker while he is learning new skills.
7. It will enable all to return to the classroom to have technical training; updated without suffering severe financial losses. Our society is changing so rapidly that no one at age 16 or 18 or 22 or even at 30 or 50 can be sure that he is adequately equipped in formal learning to hold a wage earning job for the rest of his life.

The wage scale for attending school should be between the level of relief and unemployment benefits and that of full time employment wages. Part of it could be paid during the school term and the remainder at the successful completion of the course.

The most important natural resource of our country is the people and their technical skills. It is fortunate that the Civil Rights Revolution and the War on Poverty are pressing for a rational use of that natural resource. The depletion of that resource must be ended at all economic and social levels. This can be America's greatest contribution to world advancement.

Submitted by Francis E. Garner
Central Phila. Branch

POLITICAL ACTION

The Socialist Party-SDF shall pursue an experimental and empirical approach to political action. Although it is the right of each member to refrain from participation in politics in a formal sense, it is proper for the Party to urge its members and locals to be active politically. At the present time there is a wide divergence of opinion in the organization on the nature of this political activity and the most effective way to carry it out.

This divergence has existed for some time and will continue until one approach proves to be an overwhelming success or until one viewpoint has been eagerly accepted by great numbers of the American people. Thus we propose that the SP-SDF membership as individuals and groups, be urged to take any of the following electoral actions:

1. Support Socialist Party candidates.
2. Support candidates of other socialist groups.
3. Support independent or liberal-labor candidates outside of the two major parties.
4. Support of independent liberal candidates within the two major parties.

Resolution submitted by Hannah and Francis Carner, Central Phila. Branch

AN ITEM ON CIVIL RIGHTS

In order to achieve great advances in Civil Rights in the next year it will probably be necessary for the Executive of the Federal government to intervene directly, particularly in the Deep South, to implement the provisions of any Civil Rights legislation passed by Congress. It is important therefore that the Election Platforms of both major parties shall contain a commitment for such action. The SP shall carry out an educational campaign to secure these commitments (or more properly a campaign in an effort to secure these commitments).

Submitted by Francis Carner,
Central Phila. Branch

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL SECURITY

Note: This proposal could be considered either an amendment to the Notes Toward a Master Plan - a proposal on unemployment by Arlon R. Tussing or to the Family Security proposal by other members of the Central Phila. Branch.

Preface Any complete plan for the fulfillment of Civil Rights for all citizens and also any comprehensive attack on poverty should include some radical proposals on public education. More than voting rights and more than massive public works are needed to get at the roots of the inferior economic and social status of many Negroes and to blunt the edges of poverty in the big city slums and the isolated

(continued -- page)

HAMMER AND TONGS

number 2
15 cents

DISCUSSION BULLETIN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY

SP-SDF
64 E. Van Buren
Room 810
Chicago 5, Ill.

CONTENTS:

Build the Lower First	By Bill Allen.....	Page 1
Three Themes In Foreign Policy	By Sollier Socialist Party.....	Page 4
What is the Role of the Socialist Party?	By Martin Oppenheimer.....	Page 6
Thoughts Preceding a Convention	By Peter F. Meyer.....	Page 10
Poverty in Chicago	By Illinois State Convention of the Socialist Party.....	Page 13
Civil Rights Resolution	By Illinois State Convention of the Socialist Party.....	Page 15
War on Poverty Section of Platform	By Richard Harrington.....	Page 16
Resolution on Theoretical Activity	By Local Los Angeles.....	Page 22
Resolution on New America	By Local Los Angeles.....	Page 23
An Open Letter	By Walter Orlan.....	Page 24